

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed November 16, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al. (USP 6,244,462). The Examiner next rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al.

Objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4), which sets forth that “the same reference character must never be used to designate different parts.” In objecting to the drawings, the Examiner stated that “throughout the specification [reference character] ‘51’ has been used to designate both individual connection point and individual connection pad” and that “throughout the specification ‘54’ has been used to designate both common connection point and common connection pad.” *Office Action*, November 16, 2009, p. 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Specifically, Applicant does not believe that reference characters 51 and 54, respectively, are “used to designate different parts.” That is, the “individual connection point” and “individual connection pad” terms used in the Specification are used interchangeably to define a single part/element, that being element 51. Similarly, the “common connection point” and “common connection pad” terms used in the Specification are used interchangeably to define a single part/element, that being element 54. Thus, Applicant believes the drawings to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4), as the present Specification does not include/use same reference characters to designate different parts. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al.**Claim 1**

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al. In rejecting the claim, the Examiner stated, in part, that Ehrensvard discloses a blister package that includes “stamped lines 16 positioned within [a] conductor carrier (58/60/62)... and wherein the conductor carrier includes individual conductors (58/60/62) each of which extends from an individual connecting pad 56....” *Office Action*, supra at 4. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Specifically, Applicant believes that the Examiner has

mischaracterized that which is disclosed in Ehrensvard in order to teach what is called for in claim 1.

Claim 1 calls for, in part, a blister package arrangement that includes a blister package and a conductor carrier connected to it. Openings are provided in the conductor carrier and are formed by stamped lines positioned within the conductor carrier so as to surround pockets of the blister package in a ring shape, with the stamped lines being interrupted by at least two bridge parts by means of which a covering, separated by the stamped line out of the conductor carrier and covering the pocket, is connected with the conductor carrier. The conductor carrier also includes individual conductors that each extend from individual connecting pads of the conductor carrier over at least one bridge part such that an individual conductor is severed upon removal of a tablet from a pocket of the blister package. The blister package arrangement called for in claim 1 is illustrated in FIG. 5 of the present application, for example, where the conductor carrier 10 is shown having individual conductors 52 extending from individual connecting pads 51 of conductor carrier 10. *Application*, FIG. 5. The individual conductors 52 extend from the individual connecting pads 51 and across coverings 3 of the conductor carrier 10 by way of extending over bridge parts 42, 43, such that a bridge part 42, 43 and a corresponding individual conductor 52 are severed upon removal of a tablet from a pocket of the blister package. *Application*, ¶¶[0024]-[0030]; FIG. 5.

Ehrensvard fails to teach a blister package arrangement as called for in claim 1 that includes individual conductors that each extend from individual connecting pads of the conductor carrier over at least one bridge part and that are severed upon removal of a tablet from a pocket of the blister package. Instead, Ehrensvard discloses a medication dispensing device that includes an envelope 10 having a plurality of sheets a-m that are joined together by way of folding lines 12, 18, 20. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 2, Ins. 22-46. Dispense areas 42 of blister packages 40 in sheets a-d are aligned with perforated, breakable gates 16 formed in sheets e-h by folding sheets a-d over sheets e-h along folding line 12. *Id.* As shown in FIGS. 1 and 4 of Ehrensvard, an electronic unit 50 is included in envelope 10 that is able to sense when tablets are removed from blister packages 40 through a dispense area 42 by sensing when the tablet breaks through breakable gates 16. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, Ins. 15-41. For sensing a tablet removal, a printed circuit (that includes printed circuit portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) is provided in form of a closed loop that extends from the electronic unit 50 to each of the gates 16 of envelopes 10 and back to the electronic unit 50. *Id.*

Ehrensvard further discloses that breakable gates 16 are connected with a remaining portion of the sheetlike envelopes 10 by means of two opposite non-perforated kerfs or land areas 17, 19. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 58-66. Extending over these kerfs 17, 19 are portions 58, 60, 52 of the printed circuit. When a tablet 44 is to be dispensed from the blister package 40, a pressure is applied on the gate 16 so that at least one kerf 17, 19 bursts and thus the conductivity between the conductive portions 58, 60, 62 is interrupted and the tablet can emerge through the opening provided by the opened or fully eliminated gate 16. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 4, lns. 2-13. The electric interruption is registered by the electronic unit 50 storing the place and time of the tablet dispense, basing on the information, which of the electric circuits closed loops has been interrupted. *Id.*

Ehrensvard, however, does not teach the use of individual conductors that each extend from individual connecting pads of a conductor carrier. That is, Ehrensvard does not teach individual conductors 52 as set forth in the present Specification that extend from individual connecting pads 51 of the conductor carrier 10. *See Application*, FIG. 5. Instead, as set forth above, Ehrensvard discloses a printed circuit that includes a plurality of separate closed loops, each of which corresponds to a breakable gate 16 on one of sheets e-h (i.e., conductor carriers) of envelope 10. Each closed loop circuit includes printed circuit portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62 that form the closed loop, with the circuit starting at the electronic unit 50, extending out over a breakable gate 16, and looping back to the electronic unit 50. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 15-21. Thus, there are no “individual connecting pads” located on a conductor carrier (i.e., sheets e-h) in the medication dispensing device of Ehrensvard, but instead each closed loop circuit that includes printed circuit portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62 starts at electronic unit 50, extends out across at least two sheets e-h and folds 18, 20, and loops back to terminate at electronic unit 50. *Id.* There is simply no teaching in Ehrensvard of individual connecting pads formed on a conductor carrier, out from which extend the individual conductors.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner’s characterization of elements disclosed in Ehrensvard, and the tying of those elements to corresponding elements called for in claim 1, wholly distorts the teachings of Ehrensvard. That is, the Examiner characterized the printed circuit portions 58, 60, 62 of a closed loop circuit in Ehrensvard as forming “conductor carrier 58/60/62” as well as forming “individual conductors 58/60/62.” Additionally, the Examiner characterized the printed circuit portion 56 as forming “individual connecting pad 56.” Each of these characterizations distorts the teachings of Ehrensvard. Elements 54, 56, 58, 60, 62 are shown and disclosed in Ehrensvard as forming portions of a closed loop circuit (i.e., an individual conductor). (“The

printed circuit stretches via connected printed circuit portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62 in form of here not shown closed loops from the conducting connection with the electronic unit 50 to each of the sheetlike envelopes 10 gates 16 and back to the conduction connection with the electronic unit 50.” *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 15-21.) The printed circuit portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62 do not form any part of a “conductor carrier” as asserted by the Examiner, nor do they form any “individual connecting pad” as asserted by the Examiner. The “individual connecting pad 56” identified by the Examiner is, in fact, merely a portion 56 of the circuit “stretching over the folds 12 [that] might, however, in accordance with FIG. 4, be printed with a broader width to almost exclusively avoid any risque [sic] for an unintended wire break.” *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 29-32. Thus, portion 56 in Ehrensvard is clearly not taught as forming an “individual connecting pad,” as asserted by the Examiner, but is merely a thickened portion of the circuit.

In light of at least the above, Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Ehrensvard. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 2

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al., stating that Ehrensvard discloses that “each individual conductor (58/60/62), at its end opposite its associated individual connection pad 56, is connected with a common conductor 76 which is connected to a common connection pad....” *Office Action*, supra at 4. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claim 2 calls for each individual conductor, at its end opposite its associated individual connection pad, to be connected with a common conductor which is connected to a common connection pad. FIG. 5 of the present application illustrates what is called for in claim 2, showing that individual conductors 52 extend from individual connecting pads 51 of conductor carrier 10, across coverings 3 of the conductor carrier 10, and to a common conductor 53, which in turn is connected to a common connection pad 54. *Application*, ¶[0024]; FIG. 5.

Ehrensvard fails to teach that each individual conductor (i.e., each closed loop circuit including portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) is connected with a common conductor which is connected to a common connection pad. There is simply no such teaching in Ehrensvard that the printed circuit includes a “common conductor” or a “common connection pad.” Rather, as set forth above, Ehrensvard discloses a plurality of closed loop circuits, each of which extends from the conducting connection with the electronic unit 50 to a respective gate 16 on one of sheets e-h, and

back to the conduction connection with the electronic unit 50. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 15-21. There is no “common conductor” or “common connection pad” to which a closed loop circuit (i.e., individual conductor) is connected, but instead each individual circuit/conductor is a closed loop, in that it starts and ends at the same point at electronic unit 50.

In rejecting claim 2, the Examiner’s characterization of elements disclosed in Ehrensvard, and the tying of those elements to corresponding elements called for in claim 2, wholly distorts the teachings of Ehrensvard. That is, in the reproduced FIG. 4 provided by the Examiner in the Office Action, an individual conductor is identified by the Examiner as a “common conductor carrier 76” and a thickened portion 56 of an individual conductor is identified by the Examiner as a “common connecting pad.” Each of these characterizations wholly distorts the teachings of Ehrensvard. That is, the “common conductor carrier” and “common connecting pad” identified in the reproduced FIG. 4 are merely portions 56, 58 of a separate closed-loop circuit (i.e., individual conductor) that corresponds to another breakable gate 16 on the sheet h. The Examiner has provided no disclosure or teaching in Ehrensvard that the so-identified “common conductor carrier” connects to the other individual conductor (including portions 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) shown in the reproduced FIG. 4, and such is simply not the case. Additionally, the element 76 identified by the Examiner (“common conductor 76”), *see Office Action*, supra at 4, is not connected to an individual conductor, but is instead described in Ehrensvard as a separate “reference conductor for detecting any bursting of the envelope in some not expected way and also provide a calibration information for the electronic unit 50.” *Ehrensvard*, Col. 4, lns. 43-46.

In light of at least the above, Applicant believes that claim 2 is patentably distinct from Ehrensvard. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 3

Claim 3 calls for, in part, the individual connecting pads and the common connection pad being components of an interface, which upon insertion of the blister package arrangement in a receiver device, effect a defined position orientation and is electrically connected with an electronic unit in the receiver device to detect the severance of the individual conductors. As set forth in detail above with respect to claims 1 and 2, Ehrensvard does not teach a blister package arrangement that includes a conductor carrier having individual connecting pads and a common connection pad. As such, Ehrensvard also does not teach individual connecting pads and a

common connection pad that form components of an interface that electrically connects with an electronic unit to detect the severance of the individual conductors.

Instead, and as set forth in detail above, Ehrensvard teaches a medication dispensing device that includes an electronic unit that is integrally connected to a plurality of sheets a-h that include blister packages 40 and breakable gates 16. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 2, lns. 22-46. A plurality of closed-loop printed circuits (each including portions 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) are provided that extend from the electronic unit 50 to each of the gates 16 of envelopes 10 and back to the electronic unit 50, to sense removal of tablets from blister package 40. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 15-21. Ehrensvard, however, does not teach a conductor carrier having individual connecting pads and a common connection pad that form components of an interface that electrically connects with an electronic unit to detect the severance of the individual conductors. In fact, as printed circuits extend out directly from the electronic unit 50 and return back thereto in a closed-loop arrangement, there is simply no use for a separate “interface” on one of sheets e-h that would provide an electrical connection for connecting to electronic unit 50.

In light of at least the above, Applicant believes that claim 3 is patentably distinct from Ehrensvard. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 6

Claim 6 calls for the bridge parts to be positioned diametrically opposite each other about the circumference of the stamped line along the direction of the longer extension of the stamped line, and wherein the individual conductor associated therewith extends over both bridge parts. The positioning of the bridge parts called for in claim 6 is illustrated in FIG. 5 of the present application, where bridge parts 42, 43 are shown positioned diametrically opposite each other along the direction of the longer extension of the stamped line 41. *Application*, FIG. 5. There is simply no such teaching of kerfs 17, 19 being arranged as such in Ehrensvard. The only arrangement of kerfs 17, 19 in Ehrensvard is provided in FIG. 5, where the kerfs 17, 19 are shown as being positioned along the shorter extension/dimension of the perforated breakable gate 16. See *Ehrensvard*, FIG. 5. Kerfs 17, 19 are not positioned along the direction of the longer extension of the perforated breakable gate 16, as called for in claim 6. As such, Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 6, and claim 6 is patentably distinct thereover.

Claim 8

Claim 8 calls for an individual conductor that extends only over one of the bridge parts from the conductor carrier to the covering, and from the covering back to the conductor carrier as a loop, whereby the conductor-bearing bridge part is positively severed upon tablet removal. An individual conductor as called for in claim 8 is illustrated in FIG. 11 of the present application, where individual conductor 52 extends over bridge part 42 onto covering 3, and loops back from the covering 3 to conductor carrier 10. *Application*, FIG. 11. There is simply no such teaching of an individual conductor in Ehrensvard. The only arrangement of an individual conductor Ehrensvard is provided in FIG. 5, where the circuit is shown as including a portion 60 that extends over both kerfs 17, 19 formed about breakable gate 16. *See Ehrensvard*, FIG. 5. Portion 60 does not “extend only over one of the bridge parts from the conductor carrier to the covering, and from the covering back to the conductor carrier as a loop” as called for in claim 8. As such, Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 8, and claim 8 is patentably distinct thereover.

Claim 9

Claim 9 calls for the conductor carrier to include the individual conductors on the side facing away from the blister package, and to be attached to the side facing toward the blister package by means of the sealing film of the blister package. In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner stated that Ehrensvard discloses a “conductor carrier 58/60/62” that includes “individual conductors 58/60/62 on the side facing away from the blister package 40....” *Office Action*, supra at 5. Initially, Applicant would again point out that the Examiner’s characterization of elements disclosed in Ehrensvard, and the tying of those elements to corresponding elements called for in claim 9, wholly distorts the teachings of Ehrensvard. That is, the Examiner characterized the printed circuit portions 58, 60, 62 of a closed loop circuit in Ehrensvard as forming “conductor carrier 58/60/62” as well as forming “individual conductors 58/60/62.” Additionally, the Examiner improperly characterizes Ehrensvard as disclosing that “individual conductors 58/60/62” are positioned on the side of a conductor carrier (i.e., sheets e-h) facing away from the blister package 40.

An examination of the figures in Ehrensvard shows that the cited reference does not teach that individual conductors are positioned on the side of a conductor carrier facing away from the blister package, as is called for in claim 9. That is, an examination of FIGS. 1 and 4 of Ehrensvard shows that, in fact, the “individual conductors” (i.e., closed-loop printed circuits each

including portions 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) are formed on a side facing towards blister package 40. FIG. 4 shows that the individual conductors formed on conductor carrier h are formed on a common side as a blister package 40 of sheet d. Upon a folding over of sheet h onto sheet d along fold line 12, as is shown and described with respect to FIG. 1, the individual conductors of conductor carrier h would be on a side of conductor carrier h facing towards the blister package 40 of sheet d. As such, Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 9, and claim 9 is patentably distinct thereover.

Claim 10

Claim 10 calls for the conductor carrier to be at least partially provided with an electrically insulating protective on its side facing away from the blister package that covers at least the individual conductors and a common conductor. As set forth above with respect to claim 9, Ehrensvard fails to teach individual conductors on the side of the conductor carrier facing away from the blister package. Thus, it follows that Ehrensvard also fails to teach an electrically insulating protective on its side facing away from the blister package that covers the individual conductors and a common conductor. Furthermore, as Ehrensvard fails to teach a common conductor on the carrier film, as set forth in detail above with respect to claim 2, Ehrensvard cannot teach an electrically insulating protective that covers such a common conductor. For at least these reasons, Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 10, and claim 10 is thus patentably distinct thereover

Claim 13

Claim 13 calls for the adhesive layer to be covered by a tear film that may be separated from the adhesive layer in order to connect the adhesive layer to the sealing film. Such a tear film 65' is illustrated in FIGS. 17d and 17e of the present application, and tear film 65' is described as being separable from the adhesive layer 66' to provide for bonding between the adhesive layer 66' and the sealing film 13' of the blister package 1'. *Application*, FIG. 5. The Examiner has provided no citation to Ehrensvard highlighting where such a tear film is disclosed and, in fact, there is simply no such teaching of a tear film in Ehrensvard. As such, Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 13, and claim 13 is patentably distinct thereover.

Claim 21

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvard et al. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the rejection, Applicant has nevertheless elected to amend claim 21 to further define the scope of the invention. As amended, claim 21 calls for, in part, a blister package arrangement having a conductor carrier connected to a blister package, with the conductor carrier including an interface comprised of a plurality of individual connection pads and a common connection pad configured to provide an electrical connection between the conductor carrier and an attachable electronic unit. Claim 21 further calls for a common conductor extending out from the common connection pad and an individual conductor extending out from each of the plurality of individual connection pads, over at least one bridge part of a respective cover area on the conductor carrier, and connecting to the common conductor, with the individual conductor configured to break along with the at least one bridge part that is broken when a tablet is pressed out from a corresponding pocket of the blister package.

Ehrensvard fails to teach that which is called for in claim 21. As set forth in detail above with respect to claims 1-3, Ehrensvard does not teach an interface having a plurality of individual connection pads and a common connection pad that electrically connect with an electronic unit to detect removal of a tablet from a pocket of the blister package. There is no teaching in Ehrensvard of individual conductors (i.e., a plurality of circuits each formed of portions 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62) that extend out from individual connection pads, over at least one bridge part of a respective cover area on the conductor carrier, and connecting to the common conductor. Instead, Ehrensvard merely discloses a plurality of closed-loop printed circuits that each extend out directly from the electronic unit 50 to each of the gates 16 of envelopes 10 and return back to the electronic unit 50 in a closed-loop arrangement. *Ehrensvard*, Col. 3, lns. 15-21. As such, there is simply no use for individual connection pads and a common connection pad to form an “interface” on one of sheets e-h that would provide an electrical connection for connecting to electronic unit 50, and such elements are completely absent from Ehrensvard. Applicant thus believes that claim 21 is patentably distinct from Ehrensvard.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-21.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Ziolkowski/

Timothy J. Ziolkowski
Registration No. 38,368
Direct Dial 262-268-8181
tjz@zpspatents.com

Dated: February 15, 2010
Attorney Docket No.: ESQ0650.001

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100